





United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835 319	04/17/2001	Fun-Kyung Lee	063516	5337

7590

04/21/2003

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER

RODRIGUEZ, ARMANDO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2828

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/835,319	LEE ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Armando Rodriguez	2828	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the c ver sheet with the	e correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appl 1) a timely filed amendment wh al (with appeal fee); or (3) a tim	ication. A proper reply to a ich places the application in	ed
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing da b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for alter than SIX MONTHS from the mains FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF	ling date of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPE	:P
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Of timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	of extension and the corresponding and f the shortened statutory period for rep fice later than three months after the n	mount of the fee. The appropriate ex ply originally set in the final Office act	tension
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying	the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number o	f finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed amendr	nent
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: _		nsidered but does NOT place	the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	Y to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmer explanation of how the new or amended claims v			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:		,	
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	_		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is		(7)/7	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	i	OUYENLEUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER	
		Paul Ip	
		Supervisor	
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office		Art UNit 2828	

Continuation She t (PTO-303)

Application No. 09/835,319

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's arguments pertain to the lower reflector of Paoli as not having first and second lower reflector, as shown in figure 1,-Paoli illustrates two portions (130) and (140) each portion emitting a different wavelength and having an upper and lower reflector.

Regarding applicant's argument pertaing to the multiple lower reflectors, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).